DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 132 EA 018 976

AUTHOR Sander, Benno
TITLE Education and Dependence: Implications for Educational Administration in Latin America and the Caribbean.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 24p.; In: The Professional Preparation and Development of Educational Administrators in Commonwealth Developing Areas. A Symposium (Barbados, August 26-30, 1985); see EA 018 975.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Education; Developed Nations; *Developing Nations; Educational Administration; Foreign Countries; Hidden Curriculum; International Relations; Power Structure; *Social Theories; Sociology
IDENTIFIERS Caribbean; *Cultural Dependency; Latin America

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the role of comparative education from the perspective of the dependent society, with particular attention to Latin America and the Caribbean. The paper starts by comparing the theories of dependence developed in both dominant and dependent societies. The Marxist theory and the liberal, "developmental" theories that are current in dominant western societies are contrasted with the structural theories more recently expressed by Latin American social scientists. The paper then looks specifically at the application of the theory of dependence to education, a development that has sparked increasing international interest. The work of two Latin American scholars, Freire and Berger, is emphasized. The paper then reviews the schools of administrative thought dominating Latin American educational administration since colonial times, including juridical, business, behavioral, and sociological approaches. According to the paper, the consequences of the Western European and colonial influences have been to leave Latin American countries saddled with formal educational structures that are inappropriate to national needs. Finding more appropriate educational forms will require abandoning both old and new imported ideas while developing new, autochthonous forms to replace them. (PGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276132

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. G. Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATION AND DEPENDENCE:

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

by

Benno Sander

Inter-american Society
for Educational Administration
Brazil

EA 018 976

Abstract

Using the phenomenon of dependence as the analytical vector, this paper examines the reciprocal limitation between education and society in light of the reciprocal limitation between dominant society and dependent society in the context of international relations. Different perspectives for the study of the phenomenon of dependence are presented with particular emphasis on the perspective of the dominant and the dependent societies. Subsequently, it is demonstrated how the phenomenon of educational dependence in the specific professional field of educational administration manifests itself in historical terms, and its consequences are discussed. Finally, there is a reflection upon the role which comparative education can and should play in Latin America and in dependent countries in general through its conscious and concrete insertion into the global process of overcoming the situation of international dependence.

Introduction

This paper starts from a fundamental premise and a defined analytical perspective, implying a concrete intellectual commitment. It starts from the premise that it is only possible to examine the theme "education and dependence" adequately within the context of the global social process in which dependence is exerted and education is practised. This premise implies an understanding of the power of reciprocal limitation between education and society in the context of the power of reciprocal limitation between dependent society and dominant society. This affirmation suggests the existence of a close association between the phenomenon of dependence and that of power which in final analysis defines and regulates the relations among nations, organizations, social classes and individuals. However, by using dependence as the analytical vector for the comparative study of education in the international context, the concept of dependence refers essentially to the structural relations among nations and to its internal effects within nations.

The phenomenon of dependence can be analyzed in diverse manners, both from the perspective of dominant countries and from that of dependent countries. In this paper, educational dependence is examined from the perspective of the dependent society conceived as the historical product of the dialectical relationship between domination and dependence. This perspective implies a critical and autochthonous intellectual stance, the basis upon which one assumes a concrete commitment. This commitment implies definition, explanation and the meeting of the economic, political and cultural needs and aspirations of the dependent society. In this essay, the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean are considered typical examples of dependent societies within the context of international relations.

Using the phenomenon of dependence as the vector of analysis, the objective of this paper is to examine the role of comparative education from the perspective of the dependent society. The paper starts with an initial introduction to some theories of dependence, their perspectives and protagonists, highlighting the original contributions to Latin America and the Caribbean. Based on this introduction to the sociology of dependence, the paper goes on to address a partial review of the literature dealing with the problem of dependence in education with its effects upon the professional field of educational administration in Latin America and the Caribbean. It concludes with a reflection upon the role which comparative education can play in Latin America and in dependent countries in general, through its conscious and concrete insertion into the global process of overcoming the condition of dependence.[1]

Sociology of Dependence

For more than a century, the phenomenon of dependence has been a subject of study of the social sciences. It has attracted increasing interest in both the rich and poor nations of the socialist bloc, the capitalist world and countries marked by mixed economies. As a consequence of the multiplicity of interests that have been created, it has become difficult to formulate a universally accepted definition of dependence. The fact is that definitions and concepts on the topic vary widely and may sometimes be contradictory. The hypothesis of Ianni, for example, is illustrative as he expresses himself as follows with regard to double euphemism in the use of the concept of dependence in Latin America:

> For the Marxists, it would be seen as a semantic recourse to be utilized (in universities, publishing companies, magazines and newspapers) in the discussion and study of the problem of imperialism. For the non-Marxists the concept of dependence would be a new and conspicuous semantic alternative that is not prohibited in the discussion and study of the external "obstacles" or "marks" of the stagnation or distortion of the capitalist development of Latin America.[2]

For the purposes of this paper, the meaning of dependence will be restricted to two perspectives: the perspective of the dominant society and the perspective of the dependent society. The former is eurocentrist and North-American while the latter has been most intensely developed in Latin America. With these two opposing perspectives in mind, reference will be made to some of the important contributions of specialized literature with the aim of facilitating the study of the role of education in the context of international relations among nations and their effects within dependent nations.

The Perspective of the Dominant Society

In the study of dependence from the perspective of the dominant society there are two major guidelines: that of the Marxists and that of the liberals. Though conflicting among themselves, both examine dependence in a unidirectional sense from the perspective of the dominant society.

The first theoretical proposition on the phenomenon of dependence was formulated by Marx in his economic analysis of history, one of the greatest contributions of his political economy.[3] In his historical vision, the notion of dependence was considered a methodological imposition to forecast the structural crises of the capitalist world. He denounced the contradictions and conflicts inherent in the accumulation of capital at the cost of low wages for labor rendered. This conflict between capital and labor reflects an unequal system of relations between the owners of capital and workers, between appropriators and the expropriated, whether they be countries, organizations, social classes or individuals.

The thesis of Marx, that capitalist imperialism is the cause of dependence, was echoed and interpreted many times in the West and in Eastern Europe as in Lenin's theory of imperialism[4] and the reinterpretation of Luxemburg.[5] These classical theories of imperialism utilize the perspective of the dominant society as their starting point to explain the situation of economic, political and cultural dependence in which the dependent countries find themselves. In their critique of capitalism as the cause of dependence among and within nations, Marx and Engels, Lenin and Luxemburg, and their interpreters consider Marxism as the general theory of emancipation from the situation of dependence. However, the ideal of emancipation espoused by Marxism has yet to take concrete form in dependent countries. This lack of empirical evidence stands as a challenge to the validity of Marxist theory as an analytical framework for explaining dependence and as a praxeological proposal for overcoming the condition of dependence in countries now characterized as dependent.

Nevertheless, Marxism is not the only theoretical guideline for the examination of the phenomenon of dependence from the perspective of the dominant society. The second theoretical guideline, in conflict with the Marxist orientation, is positivistic and evolutionary in inspiration. Instead of seeking its initial theoretical elements in Marx and Engels, it resorts to Comete and Spencer.[6] Instead of adopting revolutionary transformation as the strategy to be used in overcoming the condition of dependence, it adopts peaceful evolution, order and progress. This liberal idealism of the Western world gave rise to many of the theories of the **sociology of development**, which has been in vogue in Europe and the United States in the wake of World War II and inspired studies of the dependent nations, then often designated as **underdeveloped, developing, in the process of development, backward, emerging, transitional, of the Third World, relatively less developed**, and other simmilar classifications.

There are innumerable developmental theories that attempt to describe and explain the situation of dependence while proposing strategies for overcoming it. Although this could be amplified, only some of the theoretical efforts that have been made will be referred to, such as: Rostow's theory of development stages,[7] the theory of entrepreneurial motivation at the core of underdeveloped countries advanced by McClellannd,[8] Riggs' transitional theory of the prismatic society,[9] Eisenstadts's evolutionary theory of differentiation and integration,[10] Etzioni's theory of social change,[11] and the theory of modernization proposed by Lerner.[12] These are just a few of the many classical theoretical contributions to the sociology of development used in Europe and the United States as tools for the study of underdeveloped countries.

Within the framework of general theories of development, more specific theoretical contributions were formulated for the study of human organizations and their administration. A case in point is that of development administration, a theoretical contribution conceived in the United States after World War II and applied to developing countries in the context of comparative political theory.[13] Another similar attempt, one characterized by greater explicative power, is the model of public administration advanced by Riggs as part of his general theory of the prismatic society.[14]

In the context of the developmental movement of the social sciences in Europe and the United States after World War II, one should also cite the emphasis given to governmental planning and, consequently, to educational planning, founded upon the principles of welfare economics and the economics of education. As will be developed later, this developmental orientation is evinced in the proliferation of empirical studies and essays on the economic value of education, investment and returns in the human being, the formation of human capital, manpower training and the preparation of human resources for development and similar themes.

The concepts of the sociology of development reveal the evolutionary, neutral and ahistoric character of the movement, which conceives of the **underdevelopment/development process** from the idealist perspective of the **developed society.** According to this orientation, the situation of dependence would be gradually attenuated as the **underdeveloped societies** would evolve through successive stages until reaching the situation of **developed societies.** The assumption of these theories is that the state of development enjoyed by the **developed societies** is the standard state, the ideal state of the developmental process.

These concepts of the sociology of development adopted in Europe and the United States as analytical instruments for the study of developing nations are severely challenged by the sociology recently advanced in dependent countries. In fact, the sociological literature produced in the last decades in dependent

countries, particularly in Latin America, insists that the liberal theories of Europe and the United States do not adequately explain the phenomenon of dependence. To a lesser degree, these theories do not propose feasible solutions for overcoming the situation of dependence. As in the case of the Marxist conceptions of imperialism, the functionalist theories of the sociology of development are unable to focus adequately upon the specific reality of today's dependent society. The problem is centered on the unidirectional perspective and upon the universalist methodology adopted by both orientations. Since both conceive their theories, methods and concepts from the perspective of the dominant society, they are deficient and limited in their attempts to offer a comprehensive explanation of the specific historical dynamics of the dependent society.[15] Frank's condemnation of the sociologists who apply pattern variables and other classical concepts carelessly in the study of developing nations is particularly relevant here.[16]

The Perspective of the Dependent Society

Associated with the growing belief that the general social theories and methods elaborated in Europe and the United States are inadequate in their attempts to explain the situation of dependence of the dependent nations, there has been an increasing awareness of the necessity to formulate new concepts for the social sciences, so as to enable them to explain the reality of the dependent countries and to propose solutions for overcoming the condition of dependence. This process of conceptual formulation was made operational through the adoption of a new analytical perspective opposite to the one adopted by traditional Marxist and liberal sociology. This inversion of the analytical perspective gave rise to a daring theoretical movement in the social sciences, i.e., the theory of dependence. Schrader elaborates the theory as "the declaration of independence of Latin American sociology.[17]"

As conceived in Latin America, the theory of dependence is identified with a type of economic, sociological and political structuralism. It is concerned with the structural relations that are at the roots of inequalities among nations and within nations. The theory of dependence explains the condition of dependence from the perspective of the dependent society. It is concerned with the causes and consequences of the play of economic and political forces in which all the countries of the world participate. It reveals those who have influenced internationalism while denouncing the interests created in both the dominant and dependent countries. New concepts and new analytical categories are created to define the social structures and processes with enhanced explicative power, as **dominant/dependent, metropolis/satelite, center/periphery, oppressor/oppressed, invader/invaded,** and other similar classifications.

It is in this sociological and economic context that it becomes possible to examine specific social phenomena such as that of education, its theory and practice, policy and administration. Education has always been considered a

valuable instrument in the international and national game of power, performing specific roles based on the interests being served. For this reason, education is simultaneously conceived of as an instrument of domination and liberation, production and reproduction, dissolution and construction, maintenance and change. In summary, if in the opinion of some education is a source of order and progress, for others it is an instrument of conflict and transformation.[18] As will be developed later, the theory of dependence provides a useful framework for the study of the contradictory roles of education in modern society.

Today, there exists a considerable amount of literature on the theory of dependence in Latin America. The movement has exerted significant influence in intellectual circles, universities, governmental and inter-governmental organizations, specifically in the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), a specialized agency of the United Nations Organization. In this context it is especially clarifying to examine the economic writings based upon the theory of dependence of Prebish, who has had a decisive intellectual influence on ECLA's studies.[19] In Brazil, the conception and development of the theory of dependence is highlighted by Cardoso's sociological contribution,[20] Furtado's economic theories,[21] Ribeiro's anthropolgical studies,[22] and the educational contribution of Freire[23] and Berger.[24]

Cardoso, the most influential thinker of the movement, argues--in his penetrating publication co-authored with Faletto,[25]--that in the capitalist structure of relations between the center and the periphery the condition of populational repository has fallen to Latin America, characterized by the exploitation of primary goods and the reserve of territorial resources. These roles impose a structure of class relations that determine the course of the political and economic development of Latin American countries. Today, Cardoso's concepts of "center and periphery" are widely used to define the contrast between rich and poor nations, industrialized and agricultural countries, creditors and debtors, importers and exporters of primary goods versus exporters and importers of the dominant values and the manufactured products of the world system. An analysis of Cardoso's latest publications shows that his theory of dependence has an essentially socio-political approach, seeking to emphasize "the structural bonds between the situation of underdevelopment and the hegemonic centers of the central economies, without attributing to the latter the full determination of the dynamics of development."[26] These concepts suggest that the dependent-society is not a mirror image of the dominant society or, in other words, it is not unidirectionally determined from the outside in. Much to the contrary, the dependent society has its own specific dynamics resulting from the relationship between the reciprocal determination of the peripheral society and the central society. Hence, the dependent society and the dominant society are constructed dialectically. As such, the dependent society can be conceived of as a historical product of the dialectical relationship between domination and dependence.

Furtado[27] postulates that the incorporation of Latin America into the international division of labor led it to adopt a development model based upon the export of primary products that did not require structural changes in society. In his view, the nature of dependent agriculture and of the exploitation of mineral and forestry products fostered the appearance of a rigid class structure that not even governments of a socialist line have been able to modify. Thus, a social structure designed to maintian domination, dependence and inequality consolidated its position.

Based on the premise that social theories are historically conditioned, Ribeiro tries to demonstrate that the eurocentrist theories that assume a character of general validity, such as orthodox Marxism and idealist positivism, are incapable of adequately explaining the dependent reality of the nations of Latin America. Based upon his findings, Ribeiro proposes in his book, Processo Civilizatorio,[28] a new culturally oriented theoretical paradigm founded upon the concepts of "historical updating" and "evalutionary acceleration." This addresses the sociological discussion of the reciprocal relationship between the central society and the peripheral society in light of the theory of dependence.

In the past decades, and more specifically since 1974, new proposals have been presented within the United Nations Organization under the banner of a "New International Economic Order." Its aim is breaking out of the circle of dependence among the central and peripheral countries or at least minimizing its effects. This new international order calls for cheaper loans and technical assistance rendered to poor nations, the reformulations of the International Monetary Fund so as to allow countries in need to participate effectively in the Organization, a more equitable system of international trade, the eradication of proverty and illiteracy, and the economic sovereignty of all the nations of the world.

The conception of the "New International Economic Order" was decisively influenced by the ideas of Prebish[29] and other ECLA thinkers of the theory of dependence. Up to the present, the concrete results of the proposal of the "New International Economic Order" are dismal, and the outlook for the near future is not encouraging. The failure of bilateral and multilateral meetings and conferences, and the repeatedly frustrated initiatives of inter-governmental organizations in the search for a more just international order are a clear demonstration that the underdeveloped world is far from overcoming the situation of international dependence.

Alongside the numerous followers and interpreters of the theory of dependence there are now many critics who question its descriptive and analytical possibilities. In his valuable review of the literature, Lynch[30] shows that criticisms come as much from dependency theorists who are seeking to deepen their knowledge as from those who have not taken a position in favor of the theory. He concludes that although the theory of dependence may not be necessary as a new dogma it challenges that sense of satisfaction that one may

feel in the face of traditional sociological theory. Instead of reducing its analysis to the internal situation of the organizations or countries, the theory of dependence examines their relations with the wider society and the consequent effects of this reciprocal relationship. Undoubtedly, this is one of the major contributions of the theory of dependence to contemporary social science. However, according to Latin American social science, its most important contribution is the inversion of the analytical perspective in relation to the dominant sociology of European and North-American origin. Based on this original contribution--in the framework of the effort to construct a more autonomous sociology in Latin America--this paper will now examine the phenomenon of dependence in education.

The Theory of Dependence in Education

It was in the 1960s that the theory of dependence began to be applied to education, in opposition to the developmental pedagogy fostered by such educational economists as Schultz, Becker, Denison, Hansen, Mincer, Harbison, Meyers, Davis, Bowman and Anderson.[31] As can be deduced from their technical reports and specialized publications, these and other authors had considerable influence on the programs of technical cooperation in the area of educational planning sponsored by the international development agencies of the industrialized nations and by inter-governmental organizations.

Today, there is a quantity of literature dealing with the problem of educational dependence, a fact which demonstrates that the phenomenon is penetrating into all corners of the globe. It is occurring independently of the social and political organization and is of interest as much to the underdeveloped countries as to the developed. One indicator of the importance of the problem of dependence in education is the intensity with which the matter is debated at national and international meetings and conferences of educators. A good example is the Vth World Congress of Comparative Education held in Paris in 1984, an event at which the phenomenon of educational dependence was chosen as the central theme. Debeauvais emphasized the importance of the theme for comparative education, particularly in the dependent countries, by relating its relevance "to the fact that international exchanges in the field of education have never been so intense and diverse."[32] He concluded that with the intensification of these exchanges, analysis "shows up the inequality in the relationships as far as education is concerned and the domination--economic, technological and political--of the Third World by the industrialized nations."[33]

In the United States the most important current dependency theorists in education, such as Carnoy and Levin, Bowles and Gintis, Apple and Wexler, all follow a neo-Marxist line, albeit with their own specific interpretations and, consequently, different contributions. Carnoy and Levin examine the relationships between capitalism, educational levels and class.[34] Carnoy is particularly emphatic in his denunciation of cultural imperialism[35] exerted by educational enterprises in dependent countries through joint action, whether conscious or unconscious, of the dominating elite of dominant countries and the dominating elite of dominated countries since, between these two groups, there is a communion of interests. Bowles and Gintis examine the relationship between education and labor as a phenomenon associated to the theory of reproduction.[36] Apple bases his work on Gramsci's concept of hegemony in order to study the relationship between economic and cultural domination thus demonstrating that

the school is an agent of ideological hegemony, "selective tradition" and "cultural incorporation."[37] Wexler is concerned with the phenomenon of power and how the school contributes to its distribution and to the preservation of existent inequalities.[38]

The most complete and comprehensive review of the scholarly writings on the problem of dependence in the context of educational sociology has been produced by Karabel and Halsey who examine specialized literature on the theme from two opposing perspectives: that of the functionalists and that of the dialecticians.[39] The functionalists describe and accept the phenomenon of dependence and conform to it by the fact that they consider it to be natural and inevitable in the context of the relations among nations, organizations, social classes and individuals. On the other hand, the dialecticians denounce the phenomenon of dependence, rebel against it and become politically involved in the process of overcoming the situation of dependence.

In Europe, popular contributions have been made by vanguard social scientists, such as Althusser, Bourdieu and Passeron in France,[40] Berstein and Young in England,[41] and Gramsci in Italy.[42] All of them are neo-Marxist thinkers with the exception of Berstein who inherited his creative intellectual system originally from Durkheim. However, he too, though he does not explicate this, has been influenced by the thought of Marx and Mead. These authors have important influence in university circles in all parts of the world. There are indications, however, that their initial theories have less influence today than they had ten years ago, perhaps by the fact that having fulfilled their goal of denouncing and explicating the role of reproduction and domination played by the school, they have not forwarded, as yet, sufficiently concrete proposals for overcoming historically intrenched situations.

In Latin America, Freire and Berger hold outstanding positions due to their work on educational dependence. One of Freire's most important contributions is his interpretation of the power of economic and cultural domination exerted by education, particularly through curricular content and teaching methodology. In his book, "Pedagogy of the Oppressed,"[43] he analyses the curriculum as an instrument of oppression of the poor, demonstrating how it prepares the poor to live in an orderly fashion under the banner of dependence. Although Freire's analytical scope is essentially restricted to the school in the local context, one can derive from his mental structure the existence of an <u>international pedagogy of the oppressed</u> that forms a basis for national and local pedagogies. In other words, would it not be true that the dependent and peripheral nations are oppressed by a universalist pedagogy that is conceived and exported by the hegemonic centers of the world on the basis of their economic and political interests? If this is true, would it not also be true that comparative education has contributed in the past, and would now be running the risk of contributing in the future, to the transfer of ideas, principles and methodologies from the developed North to the underdeveloped South? Therefore, what philosophy should guide the study of comparative education so that, instead of strengthening the circle of dependence, it may be able to foster cultural autonomy in the context of the global process of overcoming the state of dependence?

Another Latin American dependency scholar in education is Berger whose thesis on Education and Dependence,[44] has enriched the international bibliography. Berger's work is marked by an incisive investigation of the Brazilian educational system with special emphasis on the relation between society and education in the global context that characterizes the dependent society. He examines the concrete conditions of the national development process, and after an analysis of the origin and conditioning factors of the educational system he delves into a study of its possibilities of overcoming the global situation of dependence.

Schrader describes the international importance of Berger's work when he includes it among the theoretical efforts aimed at "the emancipation of Latin American sociology itself,"[45] in the name of the theory of dependence. In the light of the theoretical preciseness and empirical methodology that mark Berger's work, Schrader emphasizes its comparative potential, stating that it could well serve "as an important point of departure for analyses of comparable phenomena in other societies, including a country such as the Federal Republic of Germany, a nation that considers itself as dominant but which, in fact, is also dependent, to a certain extent."[46]

One of the most valuable characteristics of Berger's work is the stance he assumes as a researcher who considers himself in methodological terms to be "engaged in the situation of dependence", as a "member of the dependent society to be analyzed."[47] This explicit and intentional stance implies "a scientific critical behavior at once emancipated and emancipating" on the part of the social scientist committed to overcoming "scientific imperialism" through an intellectual attitude and systematic practice.[48] This attitude emphasizes "the uniqueness of the structures, processes and relations"[49] of the dependent society, as opposed to the European and North-American theories and concepts conceived to explain social phenomena that are historically different.

Educational Administration and Dependence: The Latin American Case

It is clarifying to note that the phenomenon of dependence is specifically evident in a professional field of study, such as educational administration, and in a specific region, such as Latin America. The critical examination of these manifestations and how they became reality leads to a reflection upon the concrete implications of the situation of dependence for the practical activities of educators, and particularly those who are responsible for educational administration. In practical terms, what is the utility of the theory of dependence for educational policy-makers and administrators? Is its usefulness limited to denouncing the situation of dependence and identifying its causes and manifestations? Or does it provide the theoretical and praxeological elements that can be used by administrators to perfect their professional performance? Finally, what is the role of comparative education in the dependent countries? How can comparative education collaborate in the overcoming of the situation of dependence, providing education in the dependent countries with greater cultural and political autonomy?

The manifestations of the problem of dependence in educational administration in Latin America and the Caribbean are evident. It is enough to examine the evolution of Latin American educational administrative thought to conclude that, to a great extent, the history of school administration in Latin America is a history of cultural dependence.[50] The fact is that up to the 1930s references made to administration during the course of Latin American educational history used the juridical approach inherited from Roman administrative law. The theoretical framework of this penetrating approach in educational administration in colonial Latin America, as in the social sciences in general, was imported from continental Europe. This cultural dependence on Europe is evident in the essentially discursive, normative and legalistic publications on education and educational administration in the general context of the social and juridical sciences of the time. It is important to note here that the initial administrative orientation of the Commonwealth Caribbean nations is different from that of the countries of Spanish and Portuguese origin, because of their political and juridical inheritance. Cultural dependence, though, is at the roots of educational development in the Caribbean as it is in Latin America in general.

Beginning in 1930, Latin American educational administration adopted the business approach, founded upon a combination of the economic rationalism of the Industrial Revolution and the pedagogical pragmatism of the New School. The most influential writings in public and educational administration in Latin America date to the business stage. The preliminaries of the business approach sought whole theoretical elements in Europe and, later, in the United States of America. For this reason, the administrative theory of that period is primarily based on the classic principles of management advanced by Fayol in France, Gulick and Urwick in England, Weber in Germany and Taylor and his associates in the United States.[51] It was in this context, for instance, that the first essays on school administration in Brazil appeared in the 1930s, authored by Teixeira,[52] a figure strongly influenced by the pedagogical pragmatism of James and Dewey; by Querino Ribeiro,[53] a disciple of Fayol; and Carneiro Leao,[54] who adopted a more eclectic orientation. It was also in that phase that the first study of Lourenco Filho[55] one should emphasize that their contribution to Latin American pedagogical studies was not restricted to the pragmatic approach. Much to the contrary, their pedagogical thought transcends the borders of the classical schools, flowing into the area of the sociological orientation of modern pedagogy and administration.

Beginning with World War II, the behavioral approach came to the fore in Latin American educational administration. This was a new theoretical current that originated in the United States as an aspect of the human relations movement developed under the leadership of Follet and Mayo and, later, through the influential work of Barnard and Simon,[56] as can be deduced from the texts translated into Portuguese and Spanish[57] and from the publications of the behavioral and functionalist scholars that invaded Latin American literature, on educational administration.

Finally, the sociological approach, conceived during the last decades under the initial leadership of Guerreiro Ramos,[59] represented an attempt to conceive of an administrative theory within the limits of Latin American reality. However, with the passing of time, this approach was unable to resist the strength of the literature from the industrialized countries of the North. This can be deduced from the invasion of a number of theoretical movements, such as development administration,[60] management by objectives,[61] administrative ecology,[62] institutional development,[63] contingency theory,[64] and many others. All the models were conceived in industrialized nations and transferred to Latin America, often with no critical evaluation.

This brief historical review reveals that educational administrative theory in Latin America is based on the academic currents of Europe and the United States. There is an increasing awareness of this fact and its pervasive consequences in today's Latin American intellectual circles which are engaged in the conception of theories and solutions from the perspective and within the limits of Latin American reality.[65]

Consequences of Educational Dependence

A major pedagogical consequence of educational dependence in Latin America and the Caribbean is the inbred formalism born of centuries of European domination.[66]

During the colonial times Spain, Portugal, Great Britain and Europe, in general, imposed much of their culture, and economic and political systems on Latin America and the Caribbean. This was followed by a growing American influence. An analysis of the origin and historical evolution of Latin American social and political institutions, including the educational institution, shows that many exogenous norms and institutions were assimilated by the Latin American society, then in its formative stages, through a mimetic process of conscious or unconscious adaptation. Many other imported institutions, however, were never incorporated into the Latin American nationalities and, consequently, are not entirely followed in real life. Prescribed formulas are ignored with the simultaneous adoption of substitute codes and alternate institutions of an autochthonous character.[67]

In the field of education mention should be made of Teixeira's enunciation of this pheonmenon, when he discusses the discrepancy between the "proclaimed values and the real values in Brazilian educational institutions,"[68] an enunciation that was tested empirically in the study of the process of implementation of the Law of Directives and Bases of National Education of 1961 in the secondary schools of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.[69] Bastos Silva joins Teixeira and endorses his criticism of imported European ideals and solutions for Brazilian education. He shows that for a long time education in Brazil was an extention of the expanding European-Western culture since the nation was growing on the periphery of that civilization without being able to break out of its primitive colonial condition.[70] With greater or lesser intensity this phenomenon is noted in all Latin American countries.

In his lucid study of the strategic aspect of the phenomenon of dependence, Guerreiro Ramso states that independently of its limitations the history of educational formalism in Brazil made a valuable contribution to the reduction of social rigidity.[71] However, notwithstanding the relatively positive value of the past educational formalism in Brazil and Latin America in general, there is a growing awareness that the current stage of development demands an educational system that is more suited to the Latin American reality and characterized by greater cultural and political autonomy. This awareness is evident among Latin American educators no matter what their guiding principles may be. In 1963, for example, Sucupira complained of the Brazilian case, stating that "up to the present, we have been unable to structure an educational system in our own image and likeness" and recommending that "we must adjust the Brazilian educational process to the total national process".[72] Some years later, Teixeira stated:

> Even today, as a transplanted system--and one badly transplanted, at that--grafted from anachronistic elements, the Brazilian educational system is, perhaps, the most serious case of maladjustment between the real nation--marching towards a stage of self-possession--and its educational institutions inherited from a period of mimesis and social imitation and devoid of autonomy and authenticity.[73]

The criticism sharpens when Saviani goes so far as to deny even the existence of a Brazilian educational system.[74] As witnessed by his writings, Chagas,[75] though contesting Saviani's thesis, is one of the most insistent defenders of a Brazilian educational theory. Similar manifestations can be found in all of the nations of Latin America. It is in this spirit of commitment to reality that this paper concludes with a reflection on the role of comparative education in the perspective of Latin American education.

Conclusion: The Role of Comparative Educational Administration

This paper, using the phenomenon of dependence as the analytical vector, has examined the reciprocal limitation between education and society in the context of the reciprocal limitation between the dominant society and the dependent society. It has examined the different perspectives for the study of the phenomenon of dependence, and more specifically the perspective of the dominant society and the perspective of the dependent society. It has analyzed how the phenomenon of educational dependence manifests itself in space and time in the specific professional field of educational administration and has discussed its consequences. Finally, the paper made an explicit option to examine education and dependence from the perspective of the dependent society of Latin America, conceived of as the historical product of the dialectical relationship between domination and dependence.

At the close of this intellectual effort, there remain a number of questions for further consideration. Where do we go from here? What are the practical implications of this effort for comparative education, more specifically for comparative educational administration in Latin America and the Caribbean? What is the role of comparative educational administration in the reciprocal relationship between education and society in the context of the reciprocal relationship between dominant society and dependent society? What is the role of intergovernmental organizations, of international technical cooperation and of scientific and professional associations in the field of educational administration?

The answers to these questions are a direct function of the perspective adopted which, in turn, has historically situated roots. Positioned in space and time, each intellectual perspective implies its own theoretical framework and specific methodological instruments. The fact is that, today there exists sufficient evidence that the conception of social theories and methodologies is determined by specific historical conditions that do not grant it universal validity for explaining phenomena and processes that occur in different historical and geographical situations.[76]

This evidence leads one to question seriously the transplant, transfer or unidirectional adaptation of theories and methodologies and of educational forms and contents from the dominant society to the dependent society without a detailed study of the needs and aspirations of the dependent society from the perspective of the dependent society. It is in this context that having assumed a commitment with the dependent society, comparative educational administration should assume the role of mediator, at once critical and autochthonous, emancipated and emancipating. This mediation, conceived of here as a concrete category based on the perspective of the dependent society, denies the unidirectional or vertical determination of the dominant society over the dependent society, in the context of the assumption that they limit one another reciprocally and construct one another dialectically. In this process of reciprocal limitation, one can only conceive of a place for comparative educational administration in the dependent society if it is designed to play a role of mediation with the objective of overcoming the situation of dependence from the economic, political and cultural perspective of the dependent society itself, in the context of international relations.

On the part of institutions and specialists in the field of educational administration, this perspective implies a courageous intellectual stance coupled with a critical and liberating behaviour. However, since the power of education within the complex of economic, political and cultural forces is quite restricted in its efforts to overcome the situation of dependence, this behaviour will only have a real impact if it is firmly engaged in the global social process of overcoming the situation of dependence.

This closing reflection brings us back to the initial premise of this paper: to suggest that our intellectual activity should be developed on the basis of a defined perspective. This perspective implies a concrete commitment. A commitment from which we cannot flee. Let it then be a commitment with Latin American and Caribbean education.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

[1]In this paper, I expand the ideas published by the Brazilian Ministry of Education and Culture with a more limited scope, as seen in Benno Sander, "Educacao e Dependencia: O Papel da Educacao Comparada," Em Aberto, Brasilia: MEC, INEP, Vol. 3, No. 24, Novembro de 1984. For another and more general discussion of the same ideas see Benno Sander, "Education and Dependence: The Role of Comparative Education," Prospects, (UNESCO, Paris: 1985), Volume XV, No. 2. In the examination of education from the perspective of the dependent society in its dialectical relations with the dominant society, I found valuable analytical elements in the theory of dependence, developed by Fernando Henrique Cardoso with the collaboration of Enzo Faletto, and its utilization as a theoretical framework in Manfredo Berger's evaluation of Brazilian educational policy in recent decades. See F.H. Cardoso and E. Faletto, Dependencia e Desenvolviment na America Latina: Ensaio de Interpretacao Sociologica, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Zahar, 1970); F.H. Cardoso, Politica e Desenvolvimento em Sociedades Dependentes, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Zahar, 1971); Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, SA, 1980).

[2]Octavio Ianni, Sociologia da Sociologia Latino-americana, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilizacao Brasileira, 1971), p. 164.

[3]Karl Marx, O Capital, Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilizacao Brasileira, 1980; K. Marx, Contribuicao a Critica da Economia Politica, (Sao Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1977).

[4]V.I. Lenin, O Imperialismo, Etapa Superior do Capitalismo, (1916).

[5]Rosa Luxemburg, The Accumulation of Capital, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1964).

[6]Auguste Comte, Cours de Philosophie Positive, (1830-1842); Herbert Spencer, System of Synthetic Philosophy, (1860).

[7]W.W. Rostow, The Stages of Economic Growth, (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1960).

[8]David D. McClelland, The Achieving Society, (Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1961).

[9]Fred W. Riggs, Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964).

[10]Samuel N. Eisenstadt, "Social Change, Differentiation and Evolution", American Sociological Review, Vol. XXIX, No. 3, (June 1964).

[11]Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change: Sources, Patterns and Consequences, (New York, Basic Books, 1964).

[12]David Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East, (Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1958).

[13]See Ferrel Heady, Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1979).

[14]Fred W. Riggs, Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964).

[15]For a critical evaluation of the limitations of both liberal and Marxist eurocentrist and North-American theories in their efforts to explain and forecast the specific dynamics of the dependent society, see Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, A Reducao Sociologica: Introducao ao Estudo da Razao Sociologica, (Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1967); A.G. Ramso, A Nova Ciencia das Organizacoes: Uma Reconceituacao da Riqueza das Nacoes, (Rio de Janeiro: Fundacao Getulio Vargas, 1982); A.G. Ramos, Introducao Critica a Sociologia Brasileira, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Andes, 1957); Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Mudancas Sociais na America Latina, (Sao Paulo: Difusao Europeia do Livro, 1969); Darcy Ribeiro, O Processo Civilizatorio: Etapas da Evolucao Socio-Cultural, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilizacao Brasileira, 1968); Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo/Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980).

[16]Andre Gunder Frank, "The Sociology of Development and the Underdevelopment of Sociology," in J.D. Cockcorft, A.G. Frank, and D.L. Johnson, eds., Dependency and Underdevelopment: Latin America's Political Economy, (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., Anchor Books, 1966).

[17]Achim Schrader, "Apresentacao", in Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo/Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1970), p. 3.

[18]For a review of the literature on the contradictory roles of education in the context of the sociology of education see Jerome Karabel and H.H. Halsey, Power and Ideology in Education, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977); Benno Sander, "Consenso e Conflito na Administracao da Educacao", Revista Brasileira de Administracao da Educacao, Vol. I, No. 1, (1983), pp. 12-34.

[19]Raul Prebish, Transformacao e Desenvolvimento: A Grande Tarefa da America Latina, (Rio de Janeiro: Fundacao Getulio Vargas, 1973), 2 Volumes; Raul Prebish, Dinamica do Desenvolvimento Latino-Americano, 2nd Edition, (Rio de Janeiro: Fundo de Cultura, 1968).

[20]Fernando H. Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, Dependencia e Desenvolvimento na America Latina: Ensaio de Interpretacao Sociologica, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Zahar, 1970). The original studies by Cardoso and Faletto were submitted to keen criticisms some of which even denied a theoretical status to their theory of dependence. Later Cardoso discusses these criticisms and presents the concept of dependence as an analytical instrument that intends to explain economic, political and cultural processes based on the concrete situations in which they occur. See F.H. Cardodo, O Modelo Politico Brasileiro e Outros Ensaios, (Sao Paulo, Difel, 1973).

[21]Celso Furtado, Economic Development in Latin America, (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

[22]Darcy Ribeiro, O Processo Civilizatorio: Etapas da Evolucao Socio-Cultural, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilizacao Brasileira, 1968).

[23]Paulo Freire, A Pedagogia do Oprimido , (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 4th Edition, 1977).

[24]Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo/Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980).

[25]Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, Dependencia e Desenvolvimento na America Latina: Ensaio de Interpretacao Sociologica, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Zahar, 1970).

[26]F.H. Cardoso and E. Faletto, Op. Cit., p. 30.

[27]Celso Furtado, Economic Development in Latin America, (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1970).

[28]Darcy Ribeiro, O Processo Civilizatorio: Etapas da Evolucao Socio-Cultural, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Civilizacao Brasileira, 1968).

[29]Raul Prebish, Transformacao e Desenvolvimento: A Grande Tarefa da America Latina, Rio de Janeiro: Fundacao Getulio Vargas, 1973, 2 Volumes; Raul Prebish, Dinamica do Desenvolvimento Latino-Americano, 2nd Edition, (Rio de Janeiro: Fundo de Cultura, 1968).

[30]Patrick D. Lynch, "Dependency Theory and Educational Administration", (New York: American Educational Research Association, State of the Art Address, Division A, 1982).

[31]Theodore W. Schultz, The Economic Value of Education, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), Gary S. Becker, Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education, (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1964); Edward F. Denison, "Measuring the Contribution of Education to Economic Growth," in Readings in the Economics of Education, (Paris: UNESCO, 1968), pp. 315-338; W. Lee Hansen, "Total and Private Rates of Return to Investment in Schooling," Journal of Political Economy, Vol. LXXI, (April, 1963), pp. 128-140; Jacob Mincer, "On the Job Training: Costs, Returns, and Some Implications," Journal of Political Economy, vol LXX, (October, 1962), Part II, pp. 50-59; Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Meyers, Education, Manpower and Economic Growth, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964); Russel G. Davis, Planning Human Resources Development: Educational Models and Schemata, (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966); Mary Jean Bowman and C. Arnold Anderson, "Concerning the Role of Education in Development," in Readings in the Economics of Education, (Paris: UNESCO, 1968), pp. 113-131. This

economic approach to education was immediately adopted in numerous studies in Latin America such as those of: Martin Carnoy, "The Cost and Return to Schooling in Mexico: A Case Study," Ph.D. Dissertation, (University of Chicago, 1964); Carl Shoup, The Fiscal System of Venezuela, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1959); Guillermo Franco Camacho, Rendimiento de la Inversion en Educacion en Colombia, CEDE, (Universidad de los Andes, Bogota, July 1964); Arnold C. Harberger and Marcelo Selowsky, "Key Factors in the Economic Growth of Chile," (Cornell University: 1966) Mimeo; Claudio de Moura Castro, "Investment in Education in Brazil: A Study of Two Industrial Communities," Ph.D. Thesis (Vanderbilt University: 1970); Samuel Levy, "An Economic Analysis of Investment in Education in the State of Sao Paulo," (Instituto de Pesquisas Economicas, Universidade de Sao Paulo: 1969); Carlos Geraldo Langoni, "A Study of Economic Growth: The Brazilian Case," Ph.D. Thesis, (University of Chicago, 1970).

[32]Michel Debeauvais, "Dependence and Interdependence in Education: Introductory Note to the Congress Theme," Vth World Congress of Comparative Education, (Paris: July 1984), Mimeo.

[33]Michel Debeauvais, Op. Cit., 1984.

[34]Martin Carnoy and Henry M. Levin, The Limits of Educational Reform, (New York: David McKay, Co., Inc., 1976).

[35]Martin Carnoy, Education as Cultural Imperialism, (New York: McKay, 1974).

[36]S. Bowles and H. Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

[37]Michael W. Apple, Ideology and Curriculum, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979); M.W. Apple, Education and Power, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).

[38]Philip Wexler, "Structure, Text and Subject: A Critical Sociology of School Knowledge," in Michael W. Apple, ed., Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).

[39]Jerome Karabel and A.H. Halsey, Power and Ideology in Education, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

[40]Louis Althusser, "Ideologie et Appareils Ideologiques d'Etat," Pensee, (Paris: June 1970); Pierre Bourdieu and Jean Claude Passeron, A Reproducao: Elementos para uma Teoria dos Sistemas de Ensino, (Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1975).

[41]Basil Berstein, Class, Codes and Control, Volume 3: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmission, 2nd Edition, (London: Rutledge and Kevin Paul, 1973), Michael Young, ed., Knowledge and Control, (London: Collier-McMillan, 1971).

[42]Antonio Gramsci, Il Materialismo Storico, (Roma Editori Riuniti, 1973); Antonio Gramsci, Os Intelectuais e a Organizacao da Cultura, (Rio de Janeiro: Civilizacao Brasileira, 1979).

[43]Paulo Freire, Pedagogia do Oprimido, (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Paz e Terra, 4th Edition, 1977); Paulo Freire, Educacao como Pratica da Liberdade, (Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 12th Edition, 1981).

[44]Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980).

[45]Achim Schrader, "Apresentacao," in Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980), p. 7.

[46]Achim Schrader, "Apresentacao," in Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980), p. 7.

[47]Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980), p. 153.

[48]Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980), p. 152.

[49]Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980), p. 153.

[50]For an overview of the evolution of administrative thought in Latin American education, see Benno Sander and Thomas Wiggins, "The Cultural Context of Administrative Theory: In Consideration of a Multidimensional Paradigm," Educational Administration Quarterly, (Winter, 1985).

[51]Henri Fayol, Administration Industrielle et Generale, (Paris: Dunod, 1916); Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick, ed., Papers on the Science of Administration, (New York: Harper and Row, 1944); Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, (New York: The Free Press, 1964); Frederick W. Taylor, Principles of Scientific Management, (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1911).

[52]Anisio S. Teixeira, Educacao Publica, sua Organizacao e Administracao, (1935). See also his article on "A Administracao Publica Brasileira e a Educacao," in Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagogicos, (Rio de Janeiro: INEP, January-March, 1956), Vol. XXV, No. 61.

[53]Jose Querino Ribeiro, Fayolismo n Administracao das Escolas Publicas, (Sao Paulo, 1938). To this initial conceptual effort in Brazilian educational organization and administration he added Ensaio de uma Teoria da Administracao Escolar, Sao Paulo: University of Sao Paulo, School of Philosophy, Bulletin No. 158, 1952, Later published under the same title, with the collaboration of Joao Gualberto de Carvalho Menezes, by Editora Saraiva, S.A., (1978).

[54]Antonio Carneiro Leao, Introducao a Administracao Escolar, (Sao Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1939).

[55]M.B. Lourenco Filho, Administracao dos Servicos de Ensino no Pais, (Rio de Janeiro: Ministry of Education and Culture, National Institute of Pedagogical Studies, 1941).

[56]Henry c. Metcalf and Lyndall Urwick, Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Follett, (New York: Harper and Row, 1942); Elton Mayo, The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization, (Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1945); Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938); Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, (New York, McMillan, 1945).

[57]Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938); Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, (New York: McMillan, 1945); Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966); Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959).

[58]See, for example, Myrtes Alonso, O Papel do Diretor na Administracao Escolar, (Sao Paulo: Editora Universidade Catolica, 1976).

[59]Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, Uma Introducao ao Historico da Organizacao Racional do Trabalho, (Rio de Janeiro: Departamento de Imprensa Nacional, 1956); Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, Introducao Critica a Sociologia Brasileira, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Andes, 1957); A.G. Ramos, A Reducao Sociologica: Introducao ao Estudo da Razao Sociologica, (Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1967 [2nd edition, revised and corrected from the first edition published in 1958]).

[60]For an analysis of development administration see for example, Ferrel Heady, Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, (New York: Marcel Dekker, 1979); Paulo Roberto Motta, "Administracao para o Desenvolvimento: A Disciplina em busca de Relevancia," Revista de Administracao Publica, Vol. VI, No. 3, (July/September, 1972), pp. 39-53.

[61]Peter F. Drucker, Management, (New York: Harper's College Press, 1977); P.F. Drucker, The Effective Executive, (London: Heinemann, 1967).

[62]Fred W. Riggs, Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964).

[63]For a review of the literature on institutional development and an evaluation of its potential and limitations see Geraldo Borges Santos "Desenvolvimento Institucional: Uma Estrategia," Revista de Administraticao Publica, Vol. XIV, No. 3, (July/September, 1980), pp. 5-18.

[64]Alfred D. Chandler, Jr., Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of American Enterprise, (Cambridge, Mass.: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1976); Tom Burns and G.M. Stalker, The Management of Innovation, (London: Tavistock Publications, 1961); Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration, (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1967).

[65]Examples of these theoretical efforts can be found in Benno Sander, "Administracao da Educacao no Brasil: E Hora da Relevancia," Educacao Brasileira, Revista do Conselho de Reitores das Universidades Brasileiras, Ano IV, No. 9, (Brasilia: 20 Semestre, 1982); Benno Sander and Thomas Wiggins, "The Cultural Context of Administrative Theory: In Consideration of a Multidimensional Paradigm," Educational Administration Quarterly, (Winter, 1985); Antonio Muniz Rezende, Jose Camilo dos Santos Filho e Maria Lucia Rocha Duarte Carvalho, "Administracao Universitaria como Ato Pedagogico," Educacao Brasileira, (Brasilia: 1978), Ano I, No. 2, pp. 15-58.

[66]For an analysis of the problem of formalism and its empirical corroboration in Brazilian education see Benno Sander, Educacao Brasileira: Valores Formais e Valores Reais, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Pioneira/FENAME/Fundacao Biblioteca Patricia Bildner, 1977).

[67]These and other characteristics associated with formalism to hold an important position in sociological studies in Brazil. The most outstanding examples were reviewed by Guerreiro Ramos, who cites Pauline Jose Soarez de Souze (Visconde do Uruguai), Ensaio sobre o Direito Administrativo, (Rio de Janeiro: 1960); Silvio Romero, Historia da Literatura Brasileira, (Rio de Janeiro: 1886), B.L. Garnier, Libreiro Editor, Vol. I; Alberto Torres, O Problema Nacional Brasileiro: Introducao a um Programa de Organizacao Nacional, (Sao Paulo: Ed. Nacional, 1938); Oliveira Viana, O Idealismo da Constituicao, (Sao Paulo: Ed. Nacional, 1939); Oliveira Viana, Instituicoes Politicas do Brasil: Morfologia do Direito Publico, (Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Jose Olympio Editora, 1949).

[68]Anisio Teixeira, "Valores Proclamados e Valores Reais nas Instituicoes Escolares Brasileiras", Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagogicos, Vol. XXXVI, No. 84, (October-December, 1961), p. 70.

[69]Benno Sander, Educacao Brasileira: Valores Formais e Valores Reais, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Pioneira/FENAME/Fundacao Biblioteca Patricia Bildner, 1977).

[70]Geraldo Bastos Silva, Educacao e Desenvolvimento Nacional, (Rio de Janeiro: ISEB, 1957); G.B. Silva, Introducao a Critica do Ensino Secundario, (Rio de Janeiro: MEC/CADES, 1959).

[71]Alberto Guerreiro Ramos, Administracao e Estrategia do Desenvolvimento, (Rio de Janeiro: Fundacao Getulio Vargas, 1966), Chap. VI.

[72]Newton Sucupira, "Relacoes entre o Conselho Federal de Educacao e os Conselhos Estaduais," Lecture delivered at the 1st Joint Meeting of Councils of Education, held in Rio de Janeiro, November 1963, in Documenta, No. 21, Vol. II, p. 27.

[73]Anisio S. Teixeira, A Educacao e um Direito, (Sao Paulo: Ed. Nacional, 1968), p. 70.

[74]Dermeval Saviani, Educacao Brasileira: Estrutura e Sistema, (Sao Paulo: Editora Saraiva, 1973).

[75]Valnir Chagas, Educacao Brasileira: O Ensino de 10 e 20 Graus, (Sao Paulo: Edicoes Saraiva, 1977).

[76]This situationalist orientation is widely adopted in Latin American social science which, though it defends the universality of science, emphasizes that it is differentiated in time and space "with respect to the problems it deals with," to use the expression of Guerreiro Ramos, in Introducao Critica a Sociologia Brasileira, (Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Andes, 1957), p. 25. The concepts of "historization" of Guerreiro Ramos and that of "evolutionary acceleration" of Ribeiro are characteristic examples of this phenomenon, which condemns scientific neutrality and the ahistoric character of social theories. For a discussion of this theme in education see Manfredo Berger, Educacao e Dependencia, (Sao Paulo and Rio de Janeiro: Difel, 1980); see also Noel F. McGinn and Luis Porter Galater, "An Introduction to Strategic Planning in Education," (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, 1983), Mimeo.